

21 March 1952

MEMORANDUM FOR: Assistant Director for Policy Coordination
FROM: Deputy Director (Plans)
SUBJECT: Paper entitled "National Psychological Strategy".
REFERENCE: Memorandum from Admiral Stevens to DD/P dated
March 19, 1952.

1. The reference memorandum, the original of which is attached here-
to, is invited to your attention. You will observe that Admiral Stevens
has gone over our paper rather carefully and has concluded that although
it is an admirable effort, there remain to be taken the two steps which
he has indicated in his memorandum. Will you please examine this matter
and let me know whether you believe it would be feasible to provide the
additional statements and information requested by Admiral Stevens and,
if so, in about how much time.

2. In order to make absolutely certain that we get off on the right
track in our further effort to comply with Admiral Stevens' request, it
might be desirable for [REDACTED] to discuss Ad-
miral Stevens' memorandum with himself or with [REDACTED].
Although I believe I understand the points which Admiral Stevens is
driving at, they are not crystal clear and even under my own interpreta-
tion of his meaning it seems to me that the job is much easier to describe
than to do. He has asked us for some very definitive pinpointing of
our present capacity and although we could furnish this up to a point,
it must necessarily be speculative as to what the various "pluses"
might be. The latter observation also holds with respect to the matter
raised in Admiral Stevens' Paragraph 4. It would take quite a lot of
speculation for us to say at this moment just how much extra advantage
can be obtained from our existing mechanisms (some controlled and some
only influenced) -- taking into consideration the fact that we have
not yet begun to realize the designed benefit from many of these.

FRANK G. WISNER

Attachment:
TS 63294, Copy 1.
TS 68538/2, Copy 2 of 25

MAR 19 1952

MEMORANDUM FOR: Mr. Frank Wisner

FROM: Vice Admiral Leslie C. Stevens

SUBJECT: Paper entitled "National Psychological Strategy",
Draft No. 4, of 13 March, 1952.

1. The subject draft contains so much of value that it should be kept available in its present form for future consultation on matters beyond those dealing with the question at issue. It comes so close to providing the viewpoints that would meet the question at issue that only two more steps are needed to make it completely useable. These steps require only some decision and a little additional thinking. There is an excellent discussion of OPC's capabilities and limitations, but it leaves the user to draw conclusions with reference to them which should be drawn within OPC. It is therefore recommended that

a. A final section be added clarifying what assets and capabilities OPC can most readily employ at present or in the very immediate future, i. e., those which are believed to be staffed, equipped, competent and effective.

b. Include in this final section a formulation of specifically what can be accomplished with those assets.

2. I appreciate the difficulties that arise in doing this, some of which are apparent in the present draft. Some of the trouble arises from the great variety of things we would like to do and, in effect, the lack of a general orientation which, however, can only be attained when the whole problem of strategy is solved. If one keeps in mind that this paper is intended to be only a very limited and circumscribed approximation to one aspect of the general problem, some of the difficulties may be eased.

3. "Accomplishment" is necessarily tied up with effectiveness, or the extent to which our national interests are furthered and those of the USSR harmed. This particular paper is not required to solve the problem of what would be the most effective things we could do, except with reference to the employment of those assets which are singled out in a. above as most immediately useable. Nor does it have to solve the policy problem of whether or not a given accomplishment would be wholly desirable and acceptable. Even with these limitations in scope,

TOP SECRET

Approved For Release 2001/08/16 : CIA-RDP80-01065A000100170023-4

- 2 -

the preparers of the paper will still have to use their native wit on what constitutes effectiveness and accomplishment. To assist in doing this, it is suggested that the new section differentiate between support of intangibles and accomplishment of a more clear-cut nature. Many of OPC's assets can only be effective in support of some US objective which is not too concrete, particularly in being able to define the extent to which it has been attained, such as the philosophy of Point IV. I would suggest separating out such "accomplishments" from those which can be visualized as gaining a clear, definite advantage.

4. This way of viewing the job should also result in some more integrated thought than is often done. Possibly some of the foreign organizations that are well controlled by OPC can be used for purposes other than those for which they were established. Some assets, such as propaganda ones, can support other assets which are suitable to direct action. And where OPC control over foreign organizations is not firm, but more in the nature of influence, -- such as a big trade union as distinct from a wholly-owned newspaper -- OPC capabilities can be expected to be greater when our objectives coincide with the objectives of such organizations.


5. If the paper ends up with a statement of any important, clear, definable advantages which can be attained through OPC's best and most useable immediate assets, it would be very gratifying. If the paper cannot end up that way and still covers its possibilities thoroughly and conscientiously, it will still have fulfilled the desired purpose of trying to think through this particular limited approach to the total problem of a "national strategy".

6. As regards the rest of the paper, I believe that Section V on "Recommended Policy Changes" should be revised to deal only with those which would further the accomplishments which will be visualized in the proposed final section. Otherwise it covers too much area that is not pertinent to this limited approach. It is also suggested that Annexes A, B, and C be omitted. This sort of thing is apt to be too encyclopaedic, often controversial, and does not appear to serve any useful purpose except possibly in helping organize the ideas of those who are responsible for preparing the paper.


L. C. Stevens

25X1A

25X1C

cc: PSB - 

Approved For Release 2001/08/16 : CIA-RDP80-01065A000100170023-4

SIGNATURE RECORD AND COVER SHEET

DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION		REGISTRY
SOURCE Wigner		CIA CONTROL NO. 63301
DOC. NO. -		DATE DOCUMENT RECEIVED 3/21
DOC. DATE 21 Mar 52		LOGGED BY mas
COPY NO. 1 of 5		
NUMBER OF PAGES 1		
NUMBER OF ATTACHMENTS #2. 68538/2; # 1 of 63294		

ATTENTION: This form will be attached to each Top Secret document received by the Central Intelligence Agency or classified Top Secret within the CIA and will remain attached to the document until such time as it is downgraded, destroyed, or transmitted outside of CIA. Access to Top Secret material is limited to those individuals whose official duties relate to the material. Each alternate or assistant Top Secret Control Officer who receives and/or releases the attached Top Secret material will sign this form and indicate period of custody in the left-hand columns provided. The name of each individual who has seen the Top Secret document and the date of handling should be indicated in the right-hand columns.

[illegible]

NOTICE OF DETACHMENT: When this form is detached from Top Secret material it shall be completed in the appropriate spaces below and transmitted to Central Top Secret Control for record.

THE TOP SECRET MATERIAL DETACHED FROM THIS FORM WAS:		BY (Signature)	
DOWNGRADED <input type="checkbox"/>			
DESTROYED <input type="checkbox"/>			
DISPATCHED (OUTSIDE CIA) TO		OFFICE	DATE
Approved For Release 2001/08/16 : CIA-RDP80-01065A000100170023-4			